

**REMARKS**

**1. Response to Amendment**

Claims 7-9 are amended and claim 10 is cancelled in response to your latest office action mailed 04/20/2006.

**2. Response to Amendment**

Thanks for your advice and help in re-writing the claims, using the original specification, and eliminating the drawings not supported by the original specification.

**1. Claim Objections**

I made your recommended changes so that claim 8 now Reads "The method of claim 7 wherein said codes have properties:" and have added the missing period.

**2. Claim Objections**

The function "means for" has been deleted.

**1. & 2. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

In response to your objections I have submitted the original specification with editing corrections in the format of a substitute specification. I have deleted all of the material you have objected to as not being supported by the original specification. Editing corrections include deleting material which is redundant, rephrasing a few of the sentences to tighten the text, inserting the descriptor "hybrid Walsh" in place of "complex Walsh", inserting the descriptor "generalized hybrid Walsh" in place of "generalized complex Walsh", and adding the descriptor "tensor product" used in mathematical analysis to describe the same function performed by the "Kronecker product" operation in engineering literature in order to help clarify the

specification to the reader not familiar with the less well known descriptor "Kronecker product".

In response to your objections I have removed all of the drawings not supported by the original specification. I have submitted the original set of drawings as amended drawings so I could correct my mistakes. Each drawing sheet with mistakes is labeled "DELETED SHEET" in the top margin and the following corrected drawing sheet is labeled "REPLACEMENT SHEET" in the top margin.

**3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

I have tried to follow the quoted guidelines in the rewritten claims 7-9 and these guidelines led me to cancel claim 10 since the subject matter is not addressed in the specification.

**4. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The terms "which" and "them" are deleted in claim 7.

**5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The indefinite phrase "for the plurality of applications" has been deleted from claims 7,9.

Thanks for all of your help and guidance.

Sincerely,



Name	Urbain A. von der Embse
Contact No.	310.641.0488
Address	Urbain A. von der Embse 7323 W. 85 <sup>th</sup> St. Westchester, CA 90045-2444